Iowa Department of Administrative Services

Information Technology Enterprise

Thomas J. Vilsack, Governor
Sally J. Pederson, Lt. Governor

Mollie K. Anderson, Director
John P. Gillispie, Chief Operating Officer

Questions and Answers about the IECDB Electronic Filing System

1. **What was total dollar amount/billable hours charged to the Iowa Ethics and Campaign Disclosure Board (IECDB) by ITE for the original implementation of the electronic filing system?**

   IECDB incurred no costs for development of its software. Some funding came from the Pooled Technology Fund and ITD. The predecessor department of the Department of Administrative Services-Information Technology Enterprise (DAS-ITE) and the DAS-ITE covered all other developmental costs.

DETAIL	TOTAL COST	BILLED AMOUNT
FY 2001		
Vendor payment (from Pooled Technology fund)	$250,000	$0
ITD staff efforts (from Pooled Technology fund)	$5,000	$0
FY 2002		
Vendor payment (from Pooled Technology fund)	$113,000	$0
ITD staff efforts (from Pooled Technology fund)	$381,000	$0
Hosting costs	$7,600	$7,600
Database costs	$2,300	$2,300
FY 2003		
ITD Staff time absorbed by ITD	$365,000	$0
Hosting costs	$8,400	$8,400
Database costs	$2,500	$2,500
FY 2004		
ITE staff time absorbed by DAS-ITE	$214,674	$0
Hosting costs	$13,778	$13,778
Database costs	$3,433	$3,433
FY 2005		
ITE staff efforts through 11-30-04	$36,985	$4,018
Hosting costs ($12,000 paid by IOWAccess)	$13,778	$1,778
Database costs	$3,433	$3,433
Total	$1,418,381	$47,240

2. **When was this system considered to be "up and running"?** The system is comprised of two parts: data collection/administration, and reporting. IECDB employees began using the data collection/administration component in July 2001, and the full system was activated in January 2002. The first full filing period for the new system ended January 19, 2002. The system has been used continuously since that time.

3. **What problems arose after implementation of the system? Were the 300 billable hours charged to the board the result of unforeseen/unexpected "bugs" in the system, i.e., troubleshooting? Were any of these billings related to ongoing maintenance needs for the electronic filing system? Or was it a combination of these two categories?** All problems have occurred in the reporting component. To resolve outstanding issues, IECDB was invited to submit a list of problems for DAS-ITE review, and it delivered the list to DAS-ITE in September 2003. IECDB signed a Service Level Agreement (SLA) in January 2004 agreeing to pay for future DAS-ITE support on issues outside those defined on the problem list. ITE worked to correct the listed problems. IECDB confirmed resolution of the problem list by signing an acceptance document on June 2, 2004.

   Since June 28, 2004, DAS-ITE has performed over 300 hours of work on issues with the system. These new issues can be divided into four categories:
   - Bona fide problems with the application and reporting system (bugs);
   - Normal maintenance/operations tasks;
   - Outside requests from IECDB or constituents directed to DAS-ITE;
   - Problem-solving related to a reporting enhancement funded by IOWAccess.

4. **If so, can ITE provide a breakdown of how much the board was billed for ongoing maintenance costs, and how much for solving problems that emerged after the system was implemented?** Work performed for IECDB from July-November, 2004 is recapped in the chart below. IECDB has agreed to pay $4,018.

CATEGORY	HOURS	COST
Bugs	106.0	$8,967
Maintenance/Operations	80.5	$6,809
Outside/Requests	73	$6,175
IOWAccess project	116.2	$9,828
Total	375.7	$31,779.00

5. **Are there special considerations in implementing, troubleshooting, and maintaining an electronic filing system for campaign reports that do not exist in with the development of other information technology systems? In other words, what might be unique about this system that has led to an apparent high level of post-implementation billings in this case?** Four issues have contributed to the need for higher-than-expected support:

- The primary purpose for which the system was developed has not worked out to be its primary use in practice. In short, a system that was designed to accommodate many transactions in a short time is now used primarily as a reporting mechanism. The database design that allows quick transaction processing is not well suited for reporting. Thus, the reporting function has required considerable support.

- Documentation of the original project was inadequate. ITE does not have original information spelling out what was to be done, by whom and at what cost. There has been confusion about system requirements and who is responsible for what.

- The system design requires users to have some technical knowledge to enter data into the system. When users have difficulty, ITE provides assistance. ITE charges to cover this support are first billed to IECDB, which then bills users. These expenditures are part of the amount in dispute.

- A complex new system component was added to improve public search capabilities. Funded by IOWAccess, the new capability creates reports and moves them to a separate server purchased by IECDB to store and access reports filed on paper. A lengthy startup support period followed launch of the new capability.

6. **According to Director Smithson, ITE has agreed to waive an unknown portion of the billing. Can you tell the committee what factors were or are being considered in negotiating the decrease in billable hours?** Some costs were waived in conjunction with the Service Level Agreement and acceptance document described in Question 3. Other costs that DAS-ITE now expects to bill relate to the new capability described in Question 5. DAS-ITE designated some hours spent to repair two bugs as "unbillable" based on the expectation that IOWAccess funds would cover the expense, but all allocated IOWAccess funds were used up to earlier in development of the new capability.

7. **Are there other "high-risk" information technology systems currently being implemented by state government (other than I/3) where the potential exists for ITE to bill substantial charges for problems or ongoing maintenance after initial implementation of the system?** Good management can keep most projects running smoothly. A quality product that meets customer needs requires less patching through each stage of its life cycle. DAS-ITE is implementing best practices in these areas:

- Careful definition of system requirements, architecture standardization, project management, and thorough testing;

- Active involvement of end users in every stage of software development;

- Thoughtful management of data conversion from old to new systems;

- Control of changes in project requirements and associated costs.

Without application of these best practices, any software project can become "high risk."

8. Can DAS-ITE provide a summary report to the committee, by state agency and by category, on the implementation, ongoing maintenance, and post-implementation troubleshooting dollar amounts and billable hours charged to each department for information technology projects in the past year or two?

DAS-ITE Hours and Costs[1], June 2003 – November 2004

DEPT	HOURS			DOLLARS		
	Development	Maintenance	Support	Development	Maintenance	Support
AG			2	$ -	$ -	$ 169
Comm	1009	195	922	$ 85,309	$ 16,495	$ 77,981
CSAC			324	$ -	$ -	$ 27,407
DAS	109		1025	$ 9,220	$ -	$ 86,705
DEA	2361		523	$ 199,738	$ -	$ 44,198
DesM			49	$ -	$ -	$ 4,145
DHS	281	47	515	$ 23,749	$ 3,933	$ 43,545
DIA	8132	246	1	$ 687,905	$ 20,835	$ 42
DOC			55	$ -	$ -	$ 4,652
DOE	3118		1	$ 263,730	$ -	$ 85
DOJ	228		264	$ 19,287	$ -	$ 22,332
DOM			77	$ -	$ -	$ 6,475
DOR	1170		194	$ 98,970	$ -	$ 16,432
DPH			532	$ -	$ -	$ 45,023
DPS	27	7	18	$ 2,263	$ 592	$ 1,523
DVRS	19			$ 1,607	$ -	$ -
DAS-GSE	1040	554	2209	$ 87,952	$ 46,884	$ 186,884
DAS-HRE	800	144	376	$ 67,630	$ 12,219	$ 31,785
I/3	104	800		$ 8,764	$ 67,672	$ -
ICN			8	$ -	$ -	$ 677
ICRC	161			$ 13,598	$ -	$ -
IECDB	502		165	$ 42,442	$ -	$ 13,957
IGOV			3	$ -	$ -	$ 254
DAS-ITE	676		2386	$ 57,196	$ -	$ 201,813
SoS			53	$ -	$ -	$ 4,483
Total	19,735	1,994	9,701	$ 1,669,360	$ 168,630	$ 820,567

---

[1] Customer agency budgets, IOWAccess or Pooled Technology dollars covered these expenses. For the data period shown, allocation of hours between maintenance and support categories may be inconsistent. A new monitoring process has been implemented to enhance consistent use of support, software modification and maintenance categories.

AG	Attorney General's Office
Comm	Department of Commerce
CSAC	College Student Aid Commission
DAS	Department of Administrative Services
DEA	Department of Elder Affairs
DesM	City of Des Moines
DHS	Department of Human Services
DIA	Department of Inspections & Appeals
DOC	Department of Corrections
DOE	Department of Education
DOJ	Justice Branch
DOM	Department of Management
DOR	Department of Revenue
DPH	Department of Public Health
DPS	Department of Public Safety
DVRS	Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services
DAS-GSE	DAS General Services Enterprise
DAS-HRE	DAS Human Resources Enterprise
I/3	Integrated Information for Iowa
ICN	Iowa Communications Network
ICRC	Iowa Civil Rights Commission
IECDB	Iowa Ethics & Campaign Disclosure Board
IGOV	Governor's Office
DAS-ITE	DAS Information Technology Enterprise
SoS	Secretary of State's Office